

March 29, 1976

two months, certainly he should have a copy of that opinion, and even then, what the Attorney General says is subject to interpretation by the members of the Legislature. I happen to be very sensitive to these areas that deal with points because I was interested in amending one of these sections last session and the Attorney General issued an opinion saying it was probably unconstitutional but the court said, no, it is not. Well, I am not going to go by what Senator DeCamp says on this matter. If you will be aware of how the statutes read and, Senator Luedtke, I can't tell you the location of it because I was not aware that Senator DeCamp had this motion on the bill, that unless you specifically say when you are dealing with a change in penalty that it relates to those matters that are pending, then it does not relate to them. But since this bill specifically refers to matters that are pending, unless Senator DeCamp can produce an opinion from the Attorney General which is very persuasive and not just make a bare declaration that it is unconstitutional, I would not buy it.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

PRESIDENT: Excuse me for interrupting. We do have a motion to lay the bill over.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: He didn't make a motion. He asked for unanimous consent.

PRESIDENT: We have one now, apparently.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then can I change my comments to that motion and I won't discuss the merits of the bill.

PRESIDENT: All right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Members of the Legislature, we have no more justification for acting on a motion to lay the bill over than we had on a unanimous consent request to bracket the bill. Unless we can be given a substantial reason for laying the bill over, I see no basis to do so and we should go on with the Final Reading. Even if Senator Kremer has had a bit of doubt cast in his mind, that same doubt does not exist in mine and I see no reason to believe that when you reduce a penalty that violates the Constitution. I will give you an example that Senator Cavanaugh offered but didn't complete. If a bill is passed by the Legislature that abolishes the death penalty, then it certainly would have to apply to anybody whose case is in court because after it is terminated you cannot impose the death penalty anyway. So it is always, I feel, appropriate to reduce a penalty, and unless the bill, which is designed to do that, does not specifically say that it will apply to pending cases, then it does